

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the non-final Office Action mailed on September 28, 2001. Reexamination in light of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-39 are currently pending in this application, with claims 1, 3 and 25 being independent.

Claims 1-2 and 4-9 were withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner.

Claims 21-39 were added by this amendment.

No new matter has been added.

Drawings

The drawings have been amended as requested by the Examiner.

Election/Restriction

The finality of the restriction requirement of Paper No. 5,

mailed on August 17, 2001, is acknowledged.

Accordingly, a petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.144 requesting review of a restriction requirement made within in the Office Action of August 17, 2001 is filed along with this response.

Claim objection

Claim 17 was allegedly objected to for the use of the term "diving to."

This rejection is traversed at least for the following reasons.

The term "diving to" is described within the specification at, for example, page 51, line 20 to page 57, line 2 and figures 33A-36.

Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 16 was rejected under rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as allegedly being indefinite.

This rejection is traversed at least for the following reasons.

While not conceding the propriety of the rejection and in order to advance prosecution of the application, claim 16 has been amended, rendering this rejection moot.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 3, 10-12 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,825,203 issued to Takeda et al. (Takeda).

This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 3 includes a plurality of driver circuits for applying a signal potential to each pixel in the display portion through the signal lines of the plurality of columns, wherein the number of output terminals of each of the plurality of driver circuits is set to a measure of the total number of

signal lines of the plurality of columns.

Takeda, while arguably disclosing a single driver circuit 31 for applying a signal potential to each pixel in the display portion through the signal lines of the plurality of columns, Takeda fails to disclose driver circuit 31 as a plurality of driver circuits.

Additionally, Takeda fails to disclose each of the plurality of driver circuits as having a number of output terminals. Instead, only a single driver circuit 31 is disclosed within Takeda. Even if it is argued that single driver circuit 31 of Takeda consists of multiple drivers, Takeda nevertheless fails to teach each of the multiple drivers as having a number of output terminals.

Furthermore, Takeda fails to disclose the output terminals of each of the plurality of driver circuits is set to a measure of the total number of signal lines of the plurality of columns, as claimed. The Office Action contends that this feature is disclosed at column 4, lines 22-26 of Takeda. However, column 4, lines 22-26 of Takeda merely provides that "FIG. 1 (A), (B) is a diagram showing the configuration of the column electrode drive circuit (13) in the drive circuit of the liquid crystal display

device to explain an embodiment of this invention and a timing waveform chart showing the voltage waveforms of the major components of the column electrode drive circuit (13)." Thus, column 4, lines 22-26 of Takeda fails to disclose the output terminals of each of the plurality of driver circuits is set to a measure of the total number of signal lines of the plurality of columns, as claimed.

For the reasons set forth hereinabove, each and every element of the invention is not found within Takeda. Therefore, Takeda does not anticipate Applicant 's invention. The claims are considered allowable for the same reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features recited.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 13-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,936,617 issued to Uchino et al. (Uchino).

This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claims 13-16 are dependent upon independent claim 3. Claim 3

includes a plurality of driver circuits for applying a signal potential to each pixel in the display portion through the signal lines of the plurality of columns, wherein the number of output terminals of each of the plurality of driver circuits is set to a measure of the total number of signal lines of the plurality of columns.

Uchino, while arguably disclosing a single driver circuit 22 for applying a signal potential to each pixel in the display portion through the signal lines of the plurality of columns, Uchino fails to disclose driver circuit 22 as a plurality of driver circuits.

Additionally, Uchino fails to disclose each of the plurality of driver circuits as having a number of output terminals. Instead, only a single driver circuit 22 is disclosed within Uchino. Even if it is argued that single driver circuit 22 of Uchino consists of multiple drivers, Uchino nevertheless fails to teach each of the multiple drivers as having a number of output terminals.

Furthermore, Uchino fails to disclose the output terminals of each of the plurality of driver circuits is set to a measure of the total number of signal lines of the plurality of columns,

as claimed.

For the reasons set forth hereinabove, each and every element of the invention is not found within Uchino. Therefore, Uchino does not anticipate Applicant 's invention. The claims are considered allowable for the same reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features recited.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

New claims

The newly added claims 21-24 further define the scope of the invention of claims 1 and 3, and are allowable for the reasons provided hereinabove.

The newly added claims 25-39 include the features of a driver circuit of the plurality of driver circuits being separate and distinct from another driver circuit of the plurality of driver circuits. Takeda or Uchino fail to teach this feature. Instead, a single driver circuit is disclosed within Takeda and Uchino. Takeda includes single driver circuit 31 while Uchino includes single driver circuit 22.

Takeda or Uchino fail to teach each driver circuit of the plurality of driver circuits having a plurality of output terminals. Instead, a single driver circuit is disclosed within Takeda and Uchino.

Takeda or Uchino fail to teach the plurality of output terminals providing a plurality of signal potentials to a group of signal lines of the plurality of signal lines, wherein the group of signal lines is less than all of said plurality of signal lines.

Allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are allowable, and the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and remarks is courteously solicited.


If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone Brian K. Dutton, Reg. No. 47,255, at 202-

955-8753 or the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: February 27, 2002

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
Lion Building
1233 20th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 955-3750
Fax: (202) 955-3751
Customer No. 23353

 47,255-
Ronald P. Kananen
Reg. No. 24,104